

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

KENNETH FRIEDMAN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LINDA ADAMS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:13-cv-01345-JCM-CWH

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Kenneth Friedman's ("plaintiff") motion to compel (doc. # 28), filed March 27, 2015. Also before the Court is Defendants Robert Bannister, Joseph Hanson, Linda Adams, and Doni K. Jennings's ("defendants") response (doc. # 30), filed April 13, 2015, and plaintiff's reply (doc. # 33), filed April 20, 2015.

Plaintiff moves the Court for an order compelling responses to his first set of interrogatories and to his request for production of documents. Defendants, in response, argue they already provided their responses to plaintiff, but concede they were late in providing these responses. Defendants add that the parties met and conferred telephonically on April 10, 2015 to address outstanding discovery issues and are currently attempting to resolve these issues. As such, defendants ask the Court to deny the instant motion or stay the decision on the motion for at least a month.


In reply, plaintiff contends he is amenable to staying a decision on the motion. Plaintiff also points out various other issues raised by the discovery defendants provided to plaintiff.

Because plaintiff seeks to compel responses to his first set of interrogatories and to his request

1 for production of documents, which defendants have already provided, the Court denies the instant
2 motion as moot. The Court also finds that plaintiff improperly raises new issues in his reply, which
3 this Court will not address.

4 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion to compel (doc. # 28) is
5 **denied as moot.**

6 DATED: May 4, 2015

7
8 
9 **C.W. Hoffman, Jr.**
10 **United States Magistrate Judge**
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28